

CITY OF RALEIGH
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION (SMAC)

Minutes

Raleigh Municipal Building · 222 W. Hargett Street · Conference Room 305 3:00pm · Thursday, November 3, 2016

Commission Members Present: Chris Bostic, David Webb, Marion Deerhake, Ken Carper, Kevin Yates, Vanessa Fleischmann, Matthew Starr (*vice chair*), Marc Horstman (*chair*), and Evan Kane

Stormwater Staff Present: Blair Hinkle, Suzette Mitchell, Kelly Daniel, Kevin Boyer, Kristin Freeman, Scott Bryant, James Pflaum, Lory Willard, Jennifer Schmitz, Brad Stuart, Chris Stanley, Carmela Teichman, Lauren Witherspoon, Ashley Rodgers, Veronica High and Veronica Barrett

Members Absent: Francine Durso

Guest: John Kistle, Lexi Herndon, Stef Mendell, Marsha Presnell-Jeanette, Nancy Wehling and Amy Wazenegger

Meeting called to order: 3:03 by Marc Horstman (*chair*)

Motions (Absentees and Minutes)

- Absence: Mr. Webb made a motion to excuse Ms. Durso from today's meeting and Mr. Starr seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.
- October Meeting Minutes: Mr. Horstman made a motion to approve and Ms. Fleischmann seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

The following items were discussed with action taken as shown.

1. **Stormwater Staff Report**

- Staffing Update
 - Communication Specialist - *Kristin Freeman started on October 17th.*
- TC-2-16 – (*Impervious surface limitation*) – *The item was approved by City Council on Tuesday, November 1st. The Communication Specialist wrote a press release that was sent out on Wednesday, November 2nd.*

Public Comments

- ***Stephanie Mendell*** (*Oak Road Circle*) *commented the neighborhood is thrilled and grateful for what is being done. She hopes there will be more tweaking to make it even stronger, particularly with the 400 square foot exemption, which they hope to see a sliding scale.*
- ***Marsha Presnell-Jeanette*** (*Stacey Street*) *commented that TC-2-16 does not directly impact the stream problems she has, but she's appreciative that the document is ready to go. She's looking forward to the next phase that hopefully will work with tree preservation and elevation changes. She's glad that Stormwater has a Communication Specialist because there's been a lack of communication from Stormwater that has hampered informing citizens on things they need to know.*
- ***Blair Hinkle*** *expressed a special thanks to the Development Review section for the work done on TC-2-16.*
- GI/LID – *this item was presented at the City Council work session on October 11th. We are looking at December 6th for a text change authorization to add the enabling language to the UDO for Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development techniques. Once it's granted by*

City Council it moves to Planning Commission, then likely their Planning Commission Text Change Committee and back to Planning Commission for a vote and then City Council for public hearing.

- Reappointment - *Chris Bostic for another term on the Stormwater Management Advisory Commission (SMAC).*
- Environmental Awards – *Ms. Deerhake has volunteered to represent the Commission.*
 - *Mr. Horstman made a motion to appoint Ms. Deerhake to the Environmental awards committee and Ms. Fleischman seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.*

2. **Drainage Assistance Project Presentation**

Chris Stanley informed the Commission there are three projects (*one previously approved*) up for review and recommendation under the new policy. A presentation will be presented on these projects and the consideration taken to bring these forward.

Estimated Project Costs	
Dixie Trail	\$105,000
Hollirose Place	\$250,000
Gary Street (<i>previously funded through Drainage Petition -October 2011</i>)	---
FY17 Project Funds Approved to Date	\$520,000
Total Estimated Project Costs This Period	\$355,000
FY17 Budget	\$1,250,000
FY17 Remaining DA Funds	\$375,000

Ms. Deerhake asked about the undecided easements issues for the Dixie Trail project and how did Commission proceed in the past when it was not fully settled for access.

Chris Stanley stated there could be a potential issue since we don't have full support from the property owner. In the past we were not getting easements. Under the cost share requirements we would do the projects, design it and it wasn't a cost share, so it's basically the same situation. With our CIP projects we don't have that requirement for dedication. We ask they be dedicated, but we have the option for easement negotiation depending on the severity and priority in terms of public benefit. You don't have that with the Drainage Assistance policy so we ask they be dedicated or we will not do it.

Blair Hinkle mentioned that a potential option is the Commission can approve the project on the southern property and not the northern property. If we go ahead and recommend approving the larger overall project, it allows us the flexibility should the northern property owner decide to grant us an easement to move forward with the bigger project. If that doesn't occur, we would inform the Commission that the project cost was scaled down and the funds left in the overall drainage budget will be accurate.

A homeowner living in the area remarked the property owner possibly is uneasy about the easement because they are trying to sell their home.

Chris Bostic stated he's believes what Blair suggested is reasonable.

Motion:

Mr. Bostic made a motion to approve the projects, and Mr. Starr seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Kevin Yates remarked that the priority model has been a great tool.

3. **Stormwater Quality Cost Share Project – 106 E Drewry Lane**

Lory Willard informed the Commission she will be presenting one project for review. The project is for a 900 sf permeable paver driveway.

Design/Construction Estimate	\$13,490
Cost of Conventional Pavers	\$4,500
Acceptable Cost	\$8,990
Stormwater/City Contribution	\$6,743
Petitioner Contribution	\$2,247

Motion:

Mr. Horstman made a motion to approve the Water Quality Cost Share project, and Mr. Yates seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. **Stormwater Quality Cost Share Policy**

Kevin Boyer provided a brief overview of the policy followed by a discussion on increasing the program participation and how to enhance the program benefits.

SMAC Feedback and Guidance

A. – ***“Downspout disconnection, tree planting, rain barrels”***

- Encourage retrofits to existing BMPs/SCMs
 - *Including conversion and uplift for water quality performance improvement*
- Consider alternatives to irrigation with potable water supply
 - *Review relevance to usage of stormwater utility funds*
 - *This represents more of an integrated water resource management view*
- Excellent idea to add in “smaller scale” options for the program
- Review/develop design standards for rainwater harvesting/cisterns/rain barrels/other
- Consider potential secondary impacts of measures
 - *Example of disconnected downspouts creating erosion concerns*
- Coordination of program measures with the City’s “Neighbor Woods” program noted by staff
- Consider adding in Regenerative Stormwater Conveyance (RSC) devices to the menu of program options
- Encourage retrofits for established commercial properties
 - *Note interaction/overlap with fee credit policy*
 - *Note this would represent voluntary stormwater treatment with the SWQCS (and also possibly the fee crediting program) providing extra incentive*

B. – ***“Reduce process, steps and time for smaller projects”***

- Review/consider the “level of design” appropriate for smaller projects
- Review/consider if smaller projects fit into the SWQCS program and/or the stormwater utility fee crediting program
- A citizen attending the SMAC meeting provided perspectives from an end user/customer of the program
 - *Pre-approved designs would be helpful*
 - *Consider partnering with providers/vendors*
 - *Current process is challenging for devices like rain barrels, for example*
- Consider a website with pre-approved standards and information
- Example provided of the City’s low volume toilets program whereby City PUD partnered with Home Depot

C. – ***“Upgrading code-required runoff treatment practices”***

- Great idea – especially for existing SCMs/retrofit projects
- This would generate probable interest from developers and designers
- City should link the increased benefit derived from the upgraded practice with the level

of the cost share (\$)

- *Link SCM performance with \$ of cost share/incentive/credit*

- City may want to consider seeking out potential repeat violators and/or those that need additional support

D. – “Projects may extend into the street ROW”

- A really good idea with examples noted such as
 - *Green streets*
 - *Green infrastructure and low impact development programs,*
 - *Working with existing topography and within wide existing right-of-ways*
- Similar in concept to upgrading water and sewer utilities
- Good example of public – private partnering

E. – “Projects eligible also for stormwater fee credits”

- A key point here is maintenance of the device – who is responsible for maintaining the device following construction?
- Review/consider the frequency and type of inspection required (for SWQCS and credits)
- Making projects also eligible for ongoing fee credits would increase the attractiveness of the program for customers
- Review/consider City providing additional funding to help with inspections of stormwater controls
- Review/consider the City’s overall Stormwater Management Program goals/standards
 - *Regulatory standard for nitrogen noted by staff*
 - *The “Maximum Extent Practicable” standard was discussed briefly by staff*
- Connect water quality performance targets with percentages available for different practices

F. – “Leaking private sanitary sewer aerial crossings”

- Does the City have an inventory of sanitary sewer aerials?
- Staff noted that the scope would be limited to the City of Raleigh corporate limits
- Is there a potential to work with City PUD to pay the up-front costs of such a program?
- SMAC noted that the County has taxing authority for infrastructure
- Could this be a potential pilot program?
- Could this be a potential separate grant-type program to support this real need within the community?
- Gather information from Durham/others
- Coordinate review with City Attorney Office

5. Other Business

- January 2017 SMAC Meeting – *The Commission discussed cancelling the January meeting.*
 - *Mr. Horstman made the motion to cancel and Ms. Fleischmann seconded. The motion passed unanimously.*

Adjournment: Mr. Horstman made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Kane and Mr. Webb seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Prepared by: Suzette Mitchell